

Farmer's Department.

For the News.
The Importance of Agricultural Pursuits.

Fairfield, Tr., March 18th, 1886.
Editor News:—I am gratified to see that the Farmers are responding to the invitation you extended to them some time since to communicate upon all subjects appertaining to the useful avocation of farming. I feel an interest and a pleasure in turning first to the "Agricultural Department" of the News, and reading the original communications, and selected pieces, which are always useful and instructive, and for the purpose of contributing a little mite, and as "Old Clover" says, for the encouragement of others, I have sat down this evening to pen a few lines, but being a novice in writing for the public eye, I feel some diffidence. But I will adopt the Davy Crockett motto, and "go ahead" and offer a few thoughts on agriculture, and if they should be worth the printing, they can be laid aside, for I have no new experiments to divulge, or new theories to promulgate at present, but will always, as far as my feeble efforts are capable, defend the reputation and promote the interest and welfare of the farmer.

Though his was the first business followed by man, and some six thousand years have elapsed since, and more than three-fourths of the wealth of the world is employed in the various branches of Agriculture, and something like three-fourths of the civilized inhabitants of the globe are engaged in that business, yet I suppose there is not an intelligent farmer but what would agree that the present system of farming is susceptible of great improvement, and is far from reaching the acme of perfection. In the earlier ages, when the Farmers had no agricultural papers to aid them in the art of farming, we may suppose it was carried on with but little skill or system, but when those papers came to the aid of the farmer, they opened up a brighter prospect in his field of labor, and agriculture progressed with more rapid strides, and will continue to progress while its advocates continue their efforts. I do not suppose there is any public journal that would benefit a reading farmer in a pecuniary point of view, more than one especially devoted to his own interests, and I see no reason why a newspaper should not devote a portion of its pages to agricultural improvement as well as to political advancement, and I think when a paper of that kind is offered to the public, it would be well for the Farmers and others to patronize it.

I think the business of Agriculture should be first on the list of occupations. I conceive it to be the motive-power by which all the machinery of the world is moved and kept in motion. Unsustained by it, Commerce and Manufactures would cease, and our beautiful villages and flourishing cities would crumble to the earth—the swift Locomotive that flies with lightning speed from city to city, would be annihilated—the huge steamship that plows over the mighty deep, bearing the comforts and necessities of life to the distant nations of the earth, would be among the things that were, and all the busy scenes of life become overshadowed with dark despair.

Seeing, then, that Agriculture is the great business of life, the foundation of all our wealth, the moving-power of our great political machinery, how is it that we are looked upon as an inferior class of the human family, and our occupation held in disrepute, and looked down upon as degrading, and not so honorable as other professions? Now, brother Farmers, what do you think of having such a low estimate laid upon us? If we have not the skill and knowledge of other professions that others have of theirs, it is not for the want of energy and native talent. Then we are alone chargeable for this inferiority. It is, in my view, our greatest interest to become superior men, and the only way I see to bring about this desirable result, is to set ourselves about the great work of self-improvement—to cultivate the mind, as well as the fields, and endeavor to attain as much natural and acquired talent in our profession as others do in theirs, and when we shall be able to treat subjects of practical interest to us in a familiar and intelligent manner, and shall have made ourselves on a par with other professions, as practical writers and speakers, we will no longer be regarded as an inferior class, but the rising generation will see and know that Agriculture is a science, worthy the attention of the most refined and best-educated minds. Yours Respectfully,
A FAIRFIELD FARMER.

For the News.
Thoughts on "Clovering Land."
"I would not allow a bit of Clover to grow on my land, if I was paid for it," said an old farmer to me one day. "Why?" I asked. "Because," said he, "it makes the ground light and loose, and the rains wash it all away," and I expect he thought that if he should ever be induced to follow "Clovering" for a number of years, he would see, instead of his farm, a big hole in the ground where it used to be.

Well, his neighbor, joining him, says "I would not be without Clover for any thing." "Why?" said I. "Because the roots penetrate to a great depth, and bring up the treasures which the sub-soil contains, and place it in reach of our corn and wheat roots, besides a good growth of clover turned under is equal to a heavy coat of manure. It also makes the soil lighter and looser by adding decayed vegetable matter to it, and the roots of plants can more easily penetrate the soil in search of nourishment. A soil made thus loose will also retain moisture better than hard, stiff, clay soils, almost destitute of vegetable, though rich in mineral matter."

"But," said I, "are you not afraid the heavy rains will wash all the soil off your hills here?" "Pooh!" said he, "the soil being loose and porous, will absorb the rain and retain its ammonia, and allow the surplus water to soak off underneath, where it will not be apt to carry off much soil, I'm thinking; but your clay soils, being almost impervious, the water collects in quantities upon the surface, and you soon have creeks and branches all over your farm."

Well, the difference in the notions of these two men in regard to raising Clover, is but one of the many differences between them. The first believes in keeping a large stock of cattle, hogs, &c., of the "scrub" breed, which eat up annually more than they are worth, and are poor all the time. During the Spring and Summer they run in the woods, and many a day is lost in hunting up the cows, and in the Winter it takes all the hay, fodder and corn that he raises to winter them, and it is a fact that they are worth one-third less in the Spring than they were in the Fall before.

His neighbor, on the contrary, keeps a good stock of cattle, hogs, horses, sheep, &c., but he keeps them well. They have good clover pastures at home—they are always in good order; consequently it don't take near as much to keep them (for I hold this as an axiom, that it takes less to keep an animal in good order than to keep one poor—I should say one-third less); therefore they don't cost near as much and are worth more, and the deduction is plain—they are vastly more profitable.

Now I don't wish to be understood as saying that all this difference exists because one of these farmers grows clover and the other does not, but I would like to see the man who will deny the benefit of clovering land, and prove his assertions by a statement of facts.

But now, Mr. Editor, one word, and this is what I am driving at. I know of many men who sow their wheat-fields with clover, which is allowed to grow as well as it can until the wheat is out, when it is pastured until late in the Fall, and perhaps stock allowed to run on it all Winter, which are taken off for a while in the Spring, until the much-abused clover is up enough to make tolerably respectable grazing for a calf, when it is "turned in on," and hogs root at it, and colts, calves and cows nibble at it, until the first month of autumn, when it is turned under and seeded to wheat, and this is called "turning under a crop of clover." Why, Mr. Editor, I doubt whether the roots of clover, treated in this way, ever exceed three inches in length. How can they? Roots cannot grow unless leaves grow, no more than leaves can grow without roots, and the Farmer who has been so greedy as to feed his stock on the few small leaves of the clover which he has sown to feed his land upon, will find himself at the close of the year, like the dog who discovered in the water the shadow of the bone he carried in his mouth, and found to his cost that his attempt to seize the shadow was but a sorry EXPERIMENT.

OATS—HOW MUCH SEED TO AN ACRE.—An old practice of this country, has been to sow two or two and one-half bushels of plump, full seed to an acre. In England, upon the best lands, four to six bushels sown to the imperial acre. Referring to the results of practice by our farmers, we believe three or a half bushels of oats, as seed, to an acre, is about the quantity that should be used. If you measure by weight, and use thimble white oat, then half a bushel less.—Ohio Farmer.

Wednesday, March 4th, was the end of Pierce's Administration and the beginning of Buchanan's. The event was thus appropriately noticed in the Cincinnati Gazette of that date: "To-day our President leaves his place and another is inaugurated. In political history this is always an era. In the present case we may call the change with hope, if not with confidence. We know not what it will bring forth, but that fact is consolatory. A traveler met another at the forks of two roads leading to the same place. Said the first—'Which of these roads is the best, sir?' 'That, sir.' 'No sir, but I have been over this, and nothing under heaven can be worse.' We may safely assume that the Pierce administration will not be exceeded in weakness, in wickedness, in wantonness, in willing depravity, and in utter worthlessness, by anything which can be produced in this generation."

There appears to be considerable excitement in Spain, as we perceive by late advices, relative to alleged outrages committed in Mexico upon Spanish citizens. The London Times says: "The Spanish Government is determined to take vigorous measures to avenge these injuries, and intends to fit out a powerful expedition to proceed from Cuba and set upon the offenders; but the difficulty is, as usual, want of money."

For the News.
Thoughts on "Clovering Land."
"I would not allow a bit of Clover to grow on my land, if I was paid for it," said an old farmer to me one day. "Why?" I asked. "Because," said he, "it makes the ground light and loose, and the rains wash it all away," and I expect he thought that if he should ever be induced to follow "Clovering" for a number of years, he would see, instead of his farm, a big hole in the ground where it used to be.

Well, his neighbor, joining him, says "I would not be without Clover for any thing." "Why?" said I. "Because the roots penetrate to a great depth, and bring up the treasures which the sub-soil contains, and place it in reach of our corn and wheat roots, besides a good growth of clover turned under is equal to a heavy coat of manure. It also makes the soil lighter and looser by adding decayed vegetable matter to it, and the roots of plants can more easily penetrate the soil in search of nourishment. A soil made thus loose will also retain moisture better than hard, stiff, clay soils, almost destitute of vegetable, though rich in mineral matter."

"But," said I, "are you not afraid the heavy rains will wash all the soil off your hills here?" "Pooh!" said he, "the soil being loose and porous, will absorb the rain and retain its ammonia, and allow the surplus water to soak off underneath, where it will not be apt to carry off much soil, I'm thinking; but your clay soils, being almost impervious, the water collects in quantities upon the surface, and you soon have creeks and branches all over your farm."

thing. "Why?" said I. "Because the roots penetrate to a great depth, and bring up the treasures which the sub-soil contains, and place it in reach of our corn and wheat roots, besides a good growth of clover turned under is equal to a heavy coat of manure. It also makes the soil lighter and looser by adding decayed vegetable matter to it, and the roots of plants can more easily penetrate the soil in search of nourishment. A soil made thus loose will also retain moisture better than hard, stiff, clay soils, almost destitute of vegetable, though rich in mineral matter."

"But," said I, "are you not afraid the heavy rains will wash all the soil off your hills here?" "Pooh!" said he, "the soil being loose and porous, will absorb the rain and retain its ammonia, and allow the surplus water to soak off underneath, where it will not be apt to carry off much soil, I'm thinking; but your clay soils, being almost impervious, the water collects in quantities upon the surface, and you soon have creeks and branches all over your farm."

Well, the difference in the notions of these two men in regard to raising Clover, is but one of the many differences between them. The first believes in keeping a large stock of cattle, hogs, &c., of the "scrub" breed, which eat up annually more than they are worth, and are poor all the time. During the Spring and Summer they run in the woods, and many a day is lost in hunting up the cows, and in the Winter it takes all the hay, fodder and corn that he raises to winter them, and it is a fact that they are worth one-third less in the Spring than they were in the Fall before.

His neighbor, on the contrary, keeps a good stock of cattle, hogs, horses, sheep, &c., but he keeps them well. They have good clover pastures at home—they are always in good order; consequently it don't take near as much to keep them (for I hold this as an axiom, that it takes less to keep an animal in good order than to keep one poor—I should say one-third less); therefore they don't cost near as much and are worth more, and the deduction is plain—they are vastly more profitable.

Now I don't wish to be understood as saying that all this difference exists because one of these farmers grows clover and the other does not, but I would like to see the man who will deny the benefit of clovering land, and prove his assertions by a statement of facts.

But now, Mr. Editor, one word, and this is what I am driving at. I know of many men who sow their wheat-fields with clover, which is allowed to grow as well as it can until the wheat is out, when it is pastured until late in the Fall, and perhaps stock allowed to run on it all Winter, which are taken off for a while in the Spring, until the much-abused clover is up enough to make tolerably respectable grazing for a calf, when it is "turned in on," and hogs root at it, and colts, calves and cows nibble at it, until the first month of autumn, when it is turned under and seeded to wheat, and this is called "turning under a crop of clover." Why, Mr. Editor, I doubt whether the roots of clover, treated in this way, ever exceed three inches in length. How can they? Roots cannot grow unless leaves grow, no more than leaves can grow without roots, and the Farmer who has been so greedy as to feed his stock on the few small leaves of the clover which he has sown to feed his land upon, will find himself at the close of the year, like the dog who discovered in the water the shadow of the bone he carried in his mouth, and found to his cost that his attempt to seize the shadow was but a sorry EXPERIMENT.

OATS—HOW MUCH SEED TO AN ACRE.—An old practice of this country, has been to sow two or two and one-half bushels of plump, full seed to an acre. In England, upon the best lands, four to six bushels sown to the imperial acre. Referring to the results of practice by our farmers, we believe three or a half bushels of oats, as seed, to an acre, is about the quantity that should be used. If you measure by weight, and use thimble white oat, then half a bushel less.—Ohio Farmer.

Wednesday, March 4th, was the end of Pierce's Administration and the beginning of Buchanan's. The event was thus appropriately noticed in the Cincinnati Gazette of that date: "To-day our President leaves his place and another is inaugurated. In political history this is always an era. In the present case we may call the change with hope, if not with confidence. We know not what it will bring forth, but that fact is consolatory. A traveler met another at the forks of two roads leading to the same place. Said the first—'Which of these roads is the best, sir?' 'That, sir.' 'No sir, but I have been over this, and nothing under heaven can be worse.' We may safely assume that the Pierce administration will not be exceeded in weakness, in wickedness, in wantonness, in willing depravity, and in utter worthlessness, by anything which can be produced in this generation."

There appears to be considerable excitement in Spain, as we perceive by late advices, relative to alleged outrages committed in Mexico upon Spanish citizens. The London Times says: "The Spanish Government is determined to take vigorous measures to avenge these injuries, and intends to fit out a powerful expedition to proceed from Cuba and set upon the offenders; but the difficulty is, as usual, want of money."

For the News.
Thoughts on "Clovering Land."
"I would not allow a bit of Clover to grow on my land, if I was paid for it," said an old farmer to me one day. "Why?" I asked. "Because," said he, "it makes the ground light and loose, and the rains wash it all away," and I expect he thought that if he should ever be induced to follow "Clovering" for a number of years, he would see, instead of his farm, a big hole in the ground where it used to be.

Well, his neighbor, joining him, says "I would not be without Clover for any thing." "Why?" said I. "Because the roots penetrate to a great depth, and bring up the treasures which the sub-soil contains, and place it in reach of our corn and wheat roots, besides a good growth of clover turned under is equal to a heavy coat of manure. It also makes the soil lighter and looser by adding decayed vegetable matter to it, and the roots of plants can more easily penetrate the soil in search of nourishment. A soil made thus loose will also retain moisture better than hard, stiff, clay soils, almost destitute of vegetable, though rich in mineral matter."

"But," said I, "are you not afraid the heavy rains will wash all the soil off your hills here?" "Pooh!" said he, "the soil being loose and porous, will absorb the rain and retain its ammonia, and allow the surplus water to soak off underneath, where it will not be apt to carry off much soil, I'm thinking; but your clay soils, being almost impervious, the water collects in quantities upon the surface, and you soon have creeks and branches all over your farm."

Well, the difference in the notions of these two men in regard to raising Clover, is but one of the many differences between them. The first believes in keeping a large stock of cattle, hogs, &c., of the "scrub" breed, which eat up annually more than they are worth, and are poor all the time. During the Spring and Summer they run in the woods, and many a day is lost in hunting up the cows, and in the Winter it takes all the hay, fodder and corn that he raises to winter them, and it is a fact that they are worth one-third less in the Spring than they were in the Fall before.

His neighbor, on the contrary, keeps a good stock of cattle, hogs, horses, sheep, &c., but he keeps them well. They have good clover pastures at home—they are always in good order; consequently it don't take near as much to keep them (for I hold this as an axiom, that it takes less to keep an animal in good order than to keep one poor—I should say one-third less); therefore they don't cost near as much and are worth more, and the deduction is plain—they are vastly more profitable.

Now I don't wish to be understood as saying that all this difference exists because one of these farmers grows clover and the other does not, but I would like to see the man who will deny the benefit of clovering land, and prove his assertions by a statement of facts.

But now, Mr. Editor, one word, and this is what I am driving at. I know of many men who sow their wheat-fields with clover, which is allowed to grow as well as it can until the wheat is out, when it is pastured until late in the Fall, and perhaps stock allowed to run on it all Winter, which are taken off for a while in the Spring, until the much-abused clover is up enough to make tolerably respectable grazing for a calf, when it is "turned in on," and hogs root at it, and colts, calves and cows nibble at it, until the first month of autumn, when it is turned under and seeded to wheat, and this is called "turning under a crop of clover." Why, Mr. Editor, I doubt whether the roots of clover, treated in this way, ever exceed three inches in length. How can they? Roots cannot grow unless leaves grow, no more than leaves can grow without roots, and the Farmer who has been so greedy as to feed his stock on the few small leaves of the clover which he has sown to feed his land upon, will find himself at the close of the year, like the dog who discovered in the water the shadow of the bone he carried in his mouth, and found to his cost that his attempt to seize the shadow was but a sorry EXPERIMENT.

OATS—HOW MUCH SEED TO AN ACRE.—An old practice of this country, has been to sow two or two and one-half bushels of plump, full seed to an acre. In England, upon the best lands, four to six bushels sown to the imperial acre. Referring to the results of practice by our farmers, we believe three or a half bushels of oats, as seed, to an acre, is about the quantity that should be used. If you measure by weight, and use thimble white oat, then half a bushel less.—Ohio Farmer.

Wednesday, March 4th, was the end of Pierce's Administration and the beginning of Buchanan's. The event was thus appropriately noticed in the Cincinnati Gazette of that date: "To-day our President leaves his place and another is inaugurated. In political history this is always an era. In the present case we may call the change with hope, if not with confidence. We know not what it will bring forth, but that fact is consolatory. A traveler met another at the forks of two roads leading to the same place. Said the first—'Which of these roads is the best, sir?' 'That, sir.' 'No sir, but I have been over this, and nothing under heaven can be worse.' We may safely assume that the Pierce administration will not be exceeded in weakness, in wickedness, in wantonness, in willing depravity, and in utter worthlessness, by anything which can be produced in this generation."

There appears to be considerable excitement in Spain, as we perceive by late advices, relative to alleged outrages committed in Mexico upon Spanish citizens. The London Times says: "The Spanish Government is determined to take vigorous measures to avenge these injuries, and intends to fit out a powerful expedition to proceed from Cuba and set upon the offenders; but the difficulty is, as usual, want of money."

For the News.
Thoughts on "Clovering Land."
"I would not allow a bit of Clover to grow on my land, if I was paid for it," said an old farmer to me one day. "Why?" I asked. "Because," said he, "it makes the ground light and loose, and the rains wash it all away," and I expect he thought that if he should ever be induced to follow "Clovering" for a number of years, he would see, instead of his farm, a big hole in the ground where it used to be.

Well, his neighbor, joining him, says "I would not be without Clover for any thing." "Why?" said I. "Because the roots penetrate to a great depth, and bring up the treasures which the sub-soil contains, and place it in reach of our corn and wheat roots, besides a good growth of clover turned under is equal to a heavy coat of manure. It also makes the soil lighter and looser by adding decayed vegetable matter to it, and the roots of plants can more easily penetrate the soil in search of nourishment. A soil made thus loose will also retain moisture better than hard, stiff, clay soils, almost destitute of vegetable, though rich in mineral matter."

"But," said I, "are you not afraid the heavy rains will wash all the soil off your hills here?" "Pooh!" said he, "the soil being loose and porous, will absorb the rain and retain its ammonia, and allow the surplus water to soak off underneath, where it will not be apt to carry off much soil, I'm thinking; but your clay soils, being almost impervious, the water collects in quantities upon the surface, and you soon have creeks and branches all over your farm."

Well, the difference in the notions of these two men in regard to raising Clover, is but one of the many differences between them. The first believes in keeping a large stock of cattle, hogs, &c., of the "scrub" breed, which eat up annually more than they are worth, and are poor all the time. During the Spring and Summer they run in the woods, and many a day is lost in hunting up the cows, and in the Winter it takes all the hay, fodder and corn that he raises to winter them, and it is a fact that they are worth one-third less in the Spring than they were in the Fall before.

His neighbor, on the contrary, keeps a good stock of cattle, hogs, horses, sheep, &c., but he keeps them well. They have good clover pastures at home—they are always in good order; consequently it don't take near as much to keep them (for I hold this as an axiom, that it takes less to keep an animal in good order than to keep one poor—I should say one-third less); therefore they don't cost near as much and are worth more, and the deduction is plain—they are vastly more profitable.

Now I don't wish to be understood as saying that all this difference exists because one of these farmers grows clover and the other does not, but I would like to see the man who will deny the benefit of clovering land, and prove his assertions by a statement of facts.

But now, Mr. Editor, one word, and this is what I am driving at. I know of many men who sow their wheat-fields with clover, which is allowed to grow as well as it can until the wheat is out, when it is pastured until late in the Fall, and perhaps stock allowed to run on it all Winter, which are taken off for a while in the Spring, until the much-abused clover is up enough to make tolerably respectable grazing for a calf, when it is "turned in on," and hogs root at it, and colts, calves and cows nibble at it, until the first month of autumn, when it is turned under and seeded to wheat, and this is called "turning under a crop of clover." Why, Mr. Editor, I doubt whether the roots of clover, treated in this way, ever exceed three inches in length. How can they? Roots cannot grow unless leaves grow, no more than leaves can grow without roots, and the Farmer who has been so greedy as to feed his stock on the few small leaves of the clover which he has sown to feed his land upon, will find himself at the close of the year, like the dog who discovered in the water the shadow of the bone he carried in his mouth, and found to his cost that his attempt to seize the shadow was but a sorry EXPERIMENT.

OATS—HOW MUCH SEED TO AN ACRE.—An old practice of this country, has been to sow two or two and one-half bushels of plump, full seed to an acre. In England, upon the best lands, four to six bushels sown to the imperial acre. Referring to the results of practice by our farmers, we believe three or a half bushels of oats, as seed, to an acre, is about the quantity that should be used. If you measure by weight, and use thimble white oat, then half a bushel less.—Ohio Farmer.

Wednesday, March 4th, was the end of Pierce's Administration and the beginning of Buchanan's. The event was thus appropriately noticed in the Cincinnati Gazette of that date: "To-day our President leaves his place and another is inaugurated. In political history this is always an era. In the present case we may call the change with hope, if not with confidence. We know not what it will bring forth, but that fact is consolatory. A traveler met another at the forks of two roads leading to the same place. Said the first—'Which of these roads is the best, sir?' 'That, sir.' 'No sir, but I have been over this, and nothing under heaven can be worse.' We may safely assume that the Pierce administration will not be exceeded in weakness, in wickedness, in wantonness, in willing depravity, and in utter worthlessness, by anything which can be produced in this generation."

There appears to be considerable excitement in Spain, as we perceive by late advices, relative to alleged outrages committed in Mexico upon Spanish citizens. The London Times says: "The Spanish Government is determined to take vigorous measures to avenge these injuries, and intends to fit out a powerful expedition to proceed from Cuba and set upon the offenders; but the difficulty is, as usual, want of money."

For the News.
Thoughts on "Clovering Land."
"I would not allow a bit of Clover to grow on my land, if I was paid for it," said an old farmer to me one day. "Why?" I asked. "Because," said he, "it makes the ground light and loose, and the rains wash it all away," and I expect he thought that if he should ever be induced to follow "Clovering" for a number of years, he would see, instead of his farm, a big hole in the ground where it used to be.

Well, his neighbor, joining him, says "I would not be without Clover for any thing." "Why?" said I. "Because the roots penetrate to a great depth, and bring up the treasures which the sub-soil contains, and place it in reach of our corn and wheat roots, besides a good growth of clover turned under is equal to a heavy coat of manure. It also makes the soil lighter and looser by adding decayed vegetable matter to it, and the roots of plants can more easily penetrate the soil in search of nourishment. A soil made thus loose will also retain moisture better than hard, stiff, clay soils, almost destitute of vegetable, though rich in mineral matter."

"But," said I, "are you not afraid the heavy rains will wash all the soil off your hills here?" "Pooh!" said he, "the soil being loose and porous, will absorb the rain and retain its ammonia, and allow the surplus water to soak off underneath, where it will not be apt to carry off much soil, I'm thinking; but your clay soils, being almost impervious, the water collects in quantities upon the surface, and you soon have creeks and branches all over your farm."

Well, the difference in the notions of these two men in regard to raising Clover, is but one of the many differences between them. The first believes in keeping a large stock of cattle, hogs, &c., of the "scrub" breed, which eat up annually more than they are worth, and are poor all the time. During the Spring and Summer they run in the woods, and many a day is lost in hunting up the cows, and in the Winter it takes all the hay, fodder and corn that he raises to winter them, and it is a fact that they are worth one-third less in the Spring than they were in the Fall before.

His neighbor, on the contrary, keeps a good stock of cattle, hogs, horses, sheep, &c., but he keeps them well. They have good clover pastures at home—they are always in good order; consequently it don't take near as much to keep them (for I hold this as an axiom, that it takes less to keep an animal in good order than to keep one poor—I should say one-third less); therefore they don't cost near as much and are worth more, and the deduction is plain—they are vastly more profitable.

Now I don't wish to be understood as saying that all this difference exists because one of these farmers grows clover and the other does not, but I would like to see the man who will deny the benefit of clovering land, and prove his assertions by a statement of facts.

But now, Mr. Editor, one word, and this is what I am driving at. I know of many men who sow their wheat-fields with clover, which is allowed to grow as well as it can until the wheat is out, when it is pastured until late in the Fall, and perhaps stock allowed to run on it all Winter, which are taken off for a while in the Spring, until the much-abused clover is up enough to make tolerably respectable grazing for a calf, when it is "turned in on," and hogs root at it, and colts, calves and cows nibble at it, until the first month of autumn, when it is turned under and seeded to wheat, and this is called "turning under a crop of clover." Why, Mr. Editor, I doubt whether the roots of clover, treated in this way, ever exceed three inches in length. How can they? Roots cannot grow unless leaves grow, no more than leaves can grow without roots, and the Farmer who has been so greedy as to feed his stock on the few small leaves of the clover which he has sown to feed his land upon, will find himself at the close of the year, like the dog who discovered in the water the shadow of the bone he carried in his mouth, and found to his cost that his attempt to seize the shadow was but a sorry EXPERIMENT.

OATS—HOW MUCH SEED TO AN ACRE.—An old practice of this country, has been to sow two or two and one-half bushels of plump, full seed to an acre. In England, upon the best lands, four to six bushels sown to the imperial acre. Referring to the results of practice by our farmers, we believe three or a half bushels of oats, as seed, to an acre, is about the quantity that should be used. If you measure by weight, and use thimble white oat, then half a bushel less.—Ohio Farmer.

Wednesday, March 4th, was the end of Pierce's Administration and the beginning of Buchanan's. The event was thus appropriately noticed in the Cincinnati Gazette of that date: "To-day our President leaves his place and another is inaugurated. In political history this is always an era. In the present case we may call the change with hope, if not with confidence. We know not what it will bring forth, but that fact is consolatory. A traveler met another at the forks of two roads leading to the same place. Said the first—'Which of these roads is the best, sir?' 'That, sir.' 'No sir, but I have been over this, and nothing under heaven can be worse.' We may safely assume that the Pierce administration will not be exceeded in weakness, in wickedness, in wantonness, in willing depravity, and in utter worthlessness, by anything which can be produced in this generation."

There appears to be considerable excitement in Spain, as we perceive by late advices, relative to alleged outrages committed in Mexico upon Spanish citizens. The London Times says: "The Spanish Government is determined to take vigorous measures to avenge these injuries, and intends to fit out a powerful expedition to proceed from Cuba and set upon the offenders; but the difficulty is, as usual, want of money."

For the News.
Thoughts on "Clovering Land."
"I would not allow a bit of Clover to grow on my land, if I was paid for it," said an old farmer to me one day. "Why?" I asked. "Because," said he, "it makes the ground light and loose, and the rains wash it all away," and I expect he thought that if he should ever be induced to follow "Clovering" for a number of years, he would see, instead of his farm, a big hole in the ground where it used to be.

Well, his neighbor, joining him, says "I would not be without Clover for any thing." "Why?" said I. "Because the roots penetrate to a great depth, and bring up the treasures which the sub-soil contains, and place it in reach of our corn and wheat roots, besides a good growth of clover turned under is equal to a heavy coat of manure. It also makes the soil lighter and looser by adding decayed vegetable matter to it, and the roots of plants can more easily penetrate the soil in search of nourishment. A soil made thus loose will also retain moisture better than hard, stiff, clay soils, almost destitute of vegetable, though rich in mineral matter."

"But," said I, "are you not afraid the heavy rains will wash all the soil off your hills here?" "Pooh!" said he, "the soil being loose and porous, will absorb the rain and retain its ammonia, and allow the surplus water to soak off underneath, where it will not be apt to carry off much soil, I'm thinking; but your clay soils, being almost impervious, the water collects in quantities upon the surface, and you soon have creeks and branches all over your farm."

Well, the difference in the notions of these two men in regard to raising Clover, is but one of the many differences between them. The first believes in keeping a large stock of cattle, hogs, &c., of the "scrub" breed, which eat up annually more than they are worth, and are poor all the time. During the Spring and Summer they run in the woods, and many a day is lost in hunting up the cows, and in the Winter it takes all the hay, fodder and corn that he raises to winter them, and it is a fact that they are worth one-third less in the Spring than they were in the Fall before.

His neighbor, on the contrary, keeps a good stock of cattle, hogs, horses, sheep, &c., but he keeps them well. They have good clover pastures at home—they are always in good order; consequently it don't take near as much to keep them (for I hold this as an axiom, that it takes less to keep an animal in good order than to keep one poor—I should say one-third less); therefore they don't cost near as much and are worth more, and the deduction is plain—they are vastly more profitable.

Now I don't wish to be understood as saying that all this difference exists because one of these farmers grows clover and the other does not, but I would like to see the man who will deny the benefit of clovering land, and prove his assertions by a statement of facts.

But now, Mr. Editor, one word, and this is what I am driving at. I know of many men who sow their wheat-fields with clover, which is allowed to grow as well as it can until the wheat is out, when it is pastured until late in the Fall, and perhaps stock allowed to run on it all Winter, which are taken off for a while in the Spring, until the much-abused clover is up enough to make tolerably respectable grazing for a calf, when it is "turned in on," and hogs root at it, and colts, calves and cows nibble at it, until the first month of autumn, when it is turned under and seeded to wheat, and this is called "turning under a crop of clover." Why, Mr. Editor, I doubt whether the roots of clover, treated in this way, ever exceed three inches in length. How can they? Roots cannot grow unless leaves grow, no more than leaves can grow without roots, and the Farmer who has been so greedy as to feed his stock on the few small leaves of the clover which he has sown to feed his land upon, will find himself at the close of the year, like the dog who discovered in the water the shadow of the bone he carried in his mouth, and found to his cost that his attempt to seize the shadow was but a sorry EXPERIMENT.

OATS—HOW MUCH SEED TO AN ACRE.—An old practice of this country, has been to sow two or two and one-half bushels of plump, full seed to an acre. In England, upon the best lands, four to six bushels sown to the imperial acre. Referring to the results of practice by our farmers, we believe three or a half bushels of oats, as seed, to an acre, is about the quantity that should be used. If you measure by weight, and use thimble white oat, then half a bushel less.—Ohio Farmer.

Wednesday, March 4th, was the end of Pierce's Administration and the beginning of Buchanan's. The event was thus appropriately noticed in the Cincinnati Gazette of that date: "To-day our President leaves his place and another is inaugurated. In political history this is always an era. In the present case we may call the change with hope, if not with confidence. We know not what it will bring forth, but that fact is consolatory. A traveler met another at the forks of two roads leading to the same place. Said the first—'Which of these roads is the best, sir?' 'That, sir.' 'No sir, but I have been over this, and nothing under heaven can be worse.' We may safely assume that the Pierce administration will not be exceeded in weakness, in wickedness, in wantonness, in willing depravity, and in utter worthlessness, by anything which can be produced in this generation."

There appears to be considerable excitement in Spain, as we perceive by late advices, relative to alleged outrages committed in Mexico upon Spanish citizens. The London Times says: "The Spanish Government is determined to take vigorous measures to avenge these injuries, and intends to fit out a powerful expedition to proceed from Cuba and set upon the offenders; but the difficulty is, as usual, want of money."

For the News.
Thoughts on "Clovering Land."
"I would not allow a bit of Clover to grow on my land, if I was paid for it," said an old farmer to me one day. "Why?" I asked. "Because," said he, "it makes the ground light and loose, and the rains wash it all away," and I expect he thought that if he should ever be induced to follow "Clovering" for a number of years, he would see, instead of his farm, a big hole in the ground where it used to be.

Well, his neighbor, joining him, says "I would not be without Clover for any thing." "Why?" said I. "Because the roots penetrate to a great depth, and bring up the treasures which the sub-soil contains, and place it in reach of our corn and wheat roots, besides a good growth of clover turned under is equal to a heavy coat of manure. It also makes the soil lighter and looser by adding decayed vegetable matter to it, and the roots of plants can more easily penetrate the soil in search of nourishment. A soil made thus loose will also retain moisture better than hard, stiff, clay soils, almost destitute of vegetable, though rich in mineral matter."

"But," said I, "are you not afraid the heavy rains will wash all the soil off your hills here?" "Pooh!" said he, "the soil being loose and porous, will absorb the rain and retain its ammonia, and allow the surplus water to soak off underneath, where it will not be apt to carry off much soil, I'm thinking; but your clay soils, being almost impervious, the water collects in quantities upon the surface, and you soon have creeks and branches all over your farm."

Well, the difference in the notions of these two men in regard to raising Clover, is but one of the many differences between them. The first believes in keeping a large stock of cattle, hogs, &c., of the "scrub" breed, which eat up annually more than they are worth, and are poor all the time. During the Spring and Summer they run in the woods, and many a day is lost in hunting up the cows, and in the Winter it takes all the hay, fodder and corn that he raises to winter them, and it is a fact that they are worth one-third less in the Spring than they were in the Fall before.

His neighbor, on the contrary, keeps a good stock of cattle, hogs, horses, sheep, &c., but he keeps them well. They have good clover pastures at home—they are always in good order; consequently it don't take near as much to keep them (for I hold this as an axiom, that it takes less to keep an animal in good order than to keep one poor—I should say one-third less); therefore they don't cost near as much and are worth more, and the deduction is plain—they are vastly more profitable.

Now I don't wish to be understood as saying that all this difference exists because one of these farmers grows clover and the other does not, but I would like to see the man who will deny the benefit of clovering land, and prove his assertions by a